

34. (NEWLY ADDED) The system of claim 33, wherein the action portion comprises a set of actions a user can initiate with respect to the display page.

REMARKS

PENDING CLAIMS

By this reply, claims 1-3, 5 and 8 have been amended and no claims have been canceled. Claims 29-34 have been newly added. Of these, claims 1, 7, 14, 21, and 27 are independent. Thus, claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lenz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,029,196). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

OBJECTION TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 have been amended to address the objections to the claims recited in the Office Action. Specifically, recitations of "step c" and "step a" have been replaced with a description of the respective step. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lenz. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, receiving a client request including a template identifier, retrieving a template corresponding to said template identifier, and determining whether the client device requires a template update using the retrieved template.

Lenz teaches a server initiated query, where a server transmits a request for file versions to a client. The client then transmits a response including the requested file

versions. *See* Lenz, col. 4, lines 59-66; col. 5, lines 38-43; and col. 6, lines 4-10. Claim 1 recites receiving a client request, not a response. In response to the client request, the server may transmit template update information to the client. In Lenz, the update query is only server initiated, and the claimed invention may be client initiated (*i.e.*, client request) rather than server initiated. Therefore, Lenz does not teach the step of receiving a client request.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, a step of determining whether said server response includes template update information. Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, a client controller that determines whether the server response includes update information.

Lenz appears to teach that received configuration files are automatically executed by the execution configuration file module 1103. *See* Lenz, col. 5, lines 47-49 and figure 11. Accordingly, Lenz fails to teach determining whether a server response includes template update information in order to update template information.

Claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, a receiver receiving a client request including a unique client identifier and a template identifier, and a server controller that determines whether a client device requires a template update based on a template identifier and a received template.

Lenz teaches a server retrieving a configuration file based on a client ID. *See* Lenz, col. 5, lines 65-67. Accordingly, Lenz fails to teach both the claimed unique client identifier and template identifier. Also, Lenz fails to teach determining whether a client device requires a template update based on a template identifier and a received template. Instead of a template identifier, Lenz uses a client identifier to retrieve a configuration file.

Regarding claim 27, Lenz fails to teach the claimed content portion and action portion of a template. Instead, Lenz transmits a file to a client including preferences, such as user mail preferences and news server preferences. The file of Lenz does not include an arrangement of one or more data fields on a display or actions available to a user.



For anticipation under 35 USC § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. *See* MPEP, § 706.02. Lenz fails to teach, explicitly or impliedly, the above-described features of independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21, and 27. Consequently, these claims are believed to be allowable, and the Applicant requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn. Newly added claims 29-34 and claims 2-6, 8-13, 15-20, 22-26 and 28, each being dependent on one of the associated independent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that the independent claims are believed to be allowable, and the Applicant requests that the rejection of the dependent claims also be withdrawn.

In addition, Lenz fails to teach many of the features of the dependent claims. For example, claim 17 recites template update information not taught by Lenz. Claim 21 recites service information not taught by Lenz. Claims 29-34 recite a content portion and an action portion of a template not taught by Lenz. These and other features of claims 1-28 are not taught by Lenz.




CONCLUSION

As the outstanding rejection has been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, the Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowability. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING

Date: 10/3/02



John W. Ryan
Reg. No. 33,771

Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No. 45,301

Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1420
(202) 663-6000
(202) 663-6363 (facsimile)

